DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 478 TM 015 029

AUTHOR Poggio, John P.; And Others
TITLE Teaching Characteristics: A Search for Classifications.
SPONS AGENCY Kansas State Dept. of Education, Topeka.; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 89
CONTRACT OERI-400-85-1066
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education (San Francisco, CA, March 28-30, 1389).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Beginning Teachers; *Classification; College Faculty; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Performance; Principals; Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior; Teacher Certification; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Education; Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Kansas Internship Plan; Performance Indicators

ABSTRACT

In this study, different educator groups had to rank a total of 112 behaviors that had previously been judged to be important to the performance of first-year teachers. Focus was on determining which behaviors are important in the assessment of beginning teachers' performance and whether or not such assessment should be differentiated according to the context in which teaching is to take place. Experienced teachers (n=1,033) across 32 certification areas, three groups of principals (n=125), and four groups of faculty (n=139) from teacher training programs participated as part of the development of valid assessment procedures for the Kansas Internship Program. The 112 behaviors were randomly separated into two sets of 56 behaviors, each representing two parallel forms of the ranking task. Seven behaviors from each form were added to the other form, creating two forms each containing 63 behaviors. Forty-nine of these behaviors were unique to each form, and 14 behaviors were common to each form, resulting in an anchor block of 14 control behaviors. The 35 group mean importance ratings on a 9-point scale were computed for each of the 112 behaviors. The forced ranking by the subjects of these behaviors resulted in considerable disagreement. Using the criterion that 34 of the 35 groups included a behavior as important, 41 behaviors were identified as a common core. When the top 10 behaviors recognized by each group were compared with the common core, 28 of the 35 groups would have had at least one behavior important to that group ignored. While some consistency was found over the certification areas and professional groups represented, the choices of important behaviors were not consistent, suggesting that the assumption of a single common core of behaviors could seriously compromise a teacher performance evaluation system. Two tables present study data. The master list of behaviors for the Kansas Internship Assessment Inventory, and two sample behaviors and their respective descriptions are appended. (SLD)

ED325478

Teaching Characteristics: A Search for Classifications

John P. Poggio & Douglas R. Glasnapp
University of Kansas
and
Judith A. Burry
University of Alabama

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Judith A Burry
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Current efforts to raise the standards for entrance into the teaching profession continue unabated. The most common reform has been to establish additional "hurdles" in the form of tests or performance evaluations on which the teacher aspirant must demonstrate knowledge, proficiency or skills competence before being allowed to continue the sequence toward certification. A survey by Sandefur (1986) found all but four states reporting the use or development of some form of state mandated examination at the time of entry to or exit from a teacher preparation program. In addition, data from Goertz (1986) identifies 11 states having performance assessment programs during the induction (internship) year before certification is granted the applicant. Yet even these data are outdated with several additional states not on the Goertz list that are known to be considering performance assessment programs as part of a state teacher internship plan.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education, San Francisco, California, March, 1989.

Material presented in this paper was sponsored by funds provided by OERI, United States Department of Education (#400-85-1066) and the Kansas State Department of Education. Opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of sponsoring agencies.

TM 015 029

While testing and performance assessment programs are being put in place in reaction to the press to raise standards of teaching practice, the consideration of the knowledge or skills being evaluated or affected often take a backseat to the assessment policy itself (Poggio, Glasnapp, Miller, Tollefson & Burry, 1986). Among the central questions that need to be addressed and answered about the behaviors being used in assessment are: are the behaviors job related?; how often is the behavior called upon in the performance of the job?; and, are the specific behaviors that constitute a standardized assessment protocol equally appropriate and suitable for all certification areas and teaching levels? These validity questions are critical to the establishment of a sound evaluation system. Without such confirmations teachers, as well as prospective teachers, are being assessed for promotion or tenure, career ladder positions, hire/dismiss and certification decisions with unsuitable instruments. Unfortunately, in the rush to get an assessment program in place, the criteria for selection or development of the mechanism for assessment can become efficiency, simplicity and availability rather than addressing the necessary validity questions surrounding the inference made from the assessment relative to the standards thought to be addressed by the program.

The key question that the profession must wrestle with relates to the definition of the content or behaviors, i.e., standards, to be assessed when certification decisions are to be made. As an outgrowth of the need for efficiency, simplicity, availability, the performance criteria resolve to a common core of skills, abilities and knowledge to be assessed across all groups. The argument is that

salient generic skills, abilities and knowledges can be identified that adequately define the standards of teaching practice, thus resulting in assessment tools that need not be different or specific to the group being assessed. This position certainly defines the prevailing practice given that a review of the assessment instrumentation in place often reveals a single instrument being applied across all situations. Recently positions have been advocated addressing the need for differentiated assessment practices (Scriven, 1986; Shulman, 1987). The position supporting the necessity for differentiated assessment provide evidence argue that conclusions about specific teaching behavior cannot be assessed relative to effectiveness without considering the context within which the behavior is to occur. Primary context variables include the content being taught, the experience of the teacher and the level and type of student affected by the teaching behavior. Throughout such discussion, certification area and teaching level become the primary first-order grouping conditions for consideration toward a differentiated assessment approach.

Evidence supporting the common core, non-differentiated assessment position often results as a function of the scaling procedures used in the collection of data addressing the content validity (adequacy of the standards being assessed) of the assessment instrumentation. Poggio, Glasnapp, Miller, Tollefson and Burry (1986) argued that procedures for validating teacher certification tests tend to be constructed to confirm rather than disconfirm validity. The same may be said when identifying behaviors to be assessed within a performance assessment program for certification. The process is usually one of collecting data allowing for

selection of behaviors based on absolute ratings of judged importance to "effective" or "acceptable" teaching behavior. Because the behaviors being judged are usually drawn from existing instruments or from the research literature, a pre-characteristic of a behavior is that it is "important" and, thus, has high probability that it will be judged as important to teaching practice when asked by groups to place it on the "importance" scaling continuum. The resultant data from this procedure has a majority of group members rating all behaviors as important, thus creating a common core of "important" behaviors defining the standards for teaching practice relating to the specific assessment instrument. While it is necessary from a validity perspective that all behaviors to be assessed be judged as important to teaching practice, the flaw in the procedure is that it does not allow for or force judgements on the "differential importance" of behaviors relative to the characteristics of the groups making the judgements.

The present paper presents data resulting from an investigation that forced different educator groups to differentially rank order behaviors that had previously all been judged important to the acceptable performance of first year teachers. Groups of experienced teachers representing 28 certification areas, three groups of administrators and four groups of faculty from higher education teacher training programs responded to data collection efforts as part of the development of valid assessment procedures for the State of Kansas Internship Program. Forced rankings of 112 behaviors that had evolved as important and necessary to the assessment of first year teachers by the different groups resulted in data that has implications relative to the need for differentiated assessment procedures.

Method

Domain of Behaviors

Development of the assessment component of the Kansas Internship Program involved the initial identification of 338 teaching behaviors for potential inclusion as the foundation for assessment protocol. Through a series of extensive field validity studies collecting data from beginning teachers, administrators and experienced teachers representing different certification areas and teaching levels, the original list of 338 behaviors were reduced to a core of 112 behaviors which were judged as important to the teaching performance of first year teachers (Burry, Poggio & Glasnapp, 1987). All of the retained behaviors met a criterion of an importance mean rating of 4.0 or higher on a five-point scale. The evaluation of the importance of a particular behavior was established by having participants rate each behavior as to its absolute importance, that is, independent of other behaviors, and frequency of use (job relatedness) to effective teaching. Analyses provided no consistent differentiation in the mean ratings across certification areas or teaching level for these behaviors, thus all behaviors were judged as important and needed to be retained as the focus of the assessment. The 112 behaviors are provided in Appendix A.

Sample of Participants

For the study reported on in this paper, stratified random sampling procedures for teacher groups were employed with certification area as the stratification variable. A random sample of 100 teachers from each of 32

certification areas was drawn from the State Department of Education listing of teachers. When fewer than 100 were available in an area, all teachers in that certification area were sampled. Usable data were provided by a total of 1033 teachers across the 32 certification areas. In the analyses, certification areas were eliminated if fewer than 10 individuals responded. This occurred for four certification areas where the frequency of teachers certified statewide is low.

Three hundred building principals were randomly sampled from the list of all principals in the state. Data from 125 principals were available for analysis with 48 identified at the elementary level, 24 at the junior high/middle school level and 53 at the secondary level.

Supplemental to a higher education instructional validity study, response packets were sent to each of the higher education institutions having accredited teacher training programs in the state. Requests for faculty participation in the identical behavior ranking process were obtained from 139 faculty categorized by teaching level: preschool or primary (21), elementary (39), junior high/middle school (22) and secondary (57).

Data Collection Procedures

To reduce the length and complexity of the task required of participants, the 112 behaviors were randomly, within performance domains (e.g., Lesson Preparation), separated into two sets of 56 behaviors each creating two parallel forms of the task. Seven behaviors from each form were selected and added to the other form creating a forms of 63 behaviors, 49 which were unique to a form

and 14 behaviors common to each form thereby creating an anchor block of 14 control behaviors. Each behavior was printed on a 3x5 card along with an elaborated operational description which accompanies each of the 112 behaviors. An illustration of two behaviors and each associated description is included in Appendix B. The 63 cards forming a set along with directions for completing the task plus a response sheet and a return mailer were sent to each of the sampled participants.

In addition to completing survey items that solicited demographic information, directions provided a step by step process for Q-sorting (Edwards, 1963) each of the 63 behaviors into one of nine groups (with the restriction of sorting seven behaviors into each ordered group) in terms of its importance for a beginning teacher to develop into an effective teacher. Once sorted, the respondent was directed to record on an answer sheet for each behavior the number value of the group into which the behavior was sorted. Each behavior could potentially be assigned a value of 1 through 9 ordering the 63 behaviors in equal intervals along the continuum in terms of their perceived importance for an intern to develop into an effective teacher.

After the relative importance judgements resulting from the forced ranking of behaviors equally spaced along the nine-point importance continuum, then an absolute judgement as to the importance of the behaviors was obtained. Participants were requested to identify that category (group), one through nine, of behaviors where they believed a line should be drawn to separate behaviors that must be evaluated from those that, while perhaps important, could forego

evaluation. This rating would identify the number as well as those behaviors from the set of 63 thought critical to the evaluation of first year teachers.

Methods of Analysis

The 35 group mean importance ratings on the nine-point scale were computed for each of the 112 behaviors. The standard deviation of the 35 group means was computed for each behavior as a simple indicator of a behavior's rating consistency (low standard deviations indicate higher consistency, with higher standard deviations indicating lower or lack of consistency). In addition, behaviors were rank ordered within each of the 35 groups on the basis of the group's mean ratings for the behaviors. From these within group rank orderings of the 112 behaviors the simple frequency of agreement was tabulated identifying for each behavior the number of the 35 groups whose mean rating of the behavior would rank it in a defined top number (e.g., top 10 or top 20, etc.) of the group's set of 112 ordered behaviors.

It is these latter frequency data for each behavior combined with two decision criteria that defines those behaviors judged by a sufficient number of groups as important and thus indicates the number of behaviors that might constitute a critical common core set that must be evaluated for all groups. The two decision criteria are: 1) What constitutes sufficient group agreement, 35 of 35, 34 of 35, ...2 1of 35?, and, 2) How far down a group's rank ordered list of behaviors should one go to define the domain of judged critically important behaviors demanding evaluation in first year teacher internship programs, the top 10, top 20,...top 80?

These decision criteria were systematically varied and the number of behaviors meeting the alternative criteria were tabulated to identify the number of behaviors that would constitute a critical core set for evaluation given specific criteria for inclusion.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 provides a frequency distribution for the 112 behaviors indicating those behaviors with standard deviations based on the 35 group means in particular ranges. As a basis for interpretation assuming a low average sample size estimate of 16 per group and a within group average standard deviation of approximately 2.4 across the behaviors, a conservatively high estimate of the expected standard error of the mean would be .6. The expected shape of the distribution of these standard deviations would be positively skewed, but still centered around the expected value of .6. Comparing the obtained frequencies in Table 1 to those expected based on interval values determined from a chi square distribution with 15 degrees of freedom, the obtained distribution differs significantly from the expected ($p < .05$). As evidence from the number of standard deviations above .6, the distribution appears to be shifted substantially to the right or to the higher values indicating that the group means show more variability (less agreement) in mean ratings for a greater number of behaviors than would be expected. For example, using a one-tailed 95 percent confidence interval in the chi square distribution with 15 degrees of freedom, the interval limit is a standard deviation of 1.00. Statistically, we would anticipate 5 percent or approximately 6 of the 112

behaviors to have variability indices greater than 1.0. In this distribution, however, 30 behaviors (or five times more) have indices greater than expected.

As simple indicators of agreement or disagreement, these initial data speak against the argument for a common core. The variability indices are too high indicating a lack of consistency in the judged importance of a majority of the behaviors. The argument, however, could be made for forming a core set from those behaviors with lower standard deviations (e.g., less than .9). The problem with this approach is that it ignores the mean ratings of the behaviors. One could, however, use the double criteria, e.g., a mean rating less than 6.0 and a standard deviation less than .9 to identify a common core. Using this example criteria, 50 of the 112 behaviors would be selected. Several behaviors (12 total) however, judged overall as important with mean ratings in the 3.0 to 4.0 range, would be eliminated from the common core.

While the means and standard deviations provide some evidence of the extent of agreement on the importance of behaviors across groups, a clearer picture of the extent of agreement across groups can be obtained from the frequency with which groups identify a behavior in their set of most important behaviors. If the behaviors are rank ordered within each group on the basis of their mean ratings and the set of most important behaviors to a group is systematically defined by varying the number of top ranked behaviors (i.e., the top 10, top 20, etc), than a simple frequency tally for each behavior identifying the number of groups in which the behavior is in the group's most important top set of behaviors will serve as the index of agreement.

Table 2 summarizes the number of the 112 behaviors that meet the dual criteria defined by the column (number of groups out of 35) and row (number of behavior defining the most important set) values. As evidenced by the values in Table 2, any set of stringent criteria produce a smaller number of behaviors meeting the criteria and thus being judged consistently "important" by a "sufficient" number of groups. For example, if a "sufficient" number of groups is at least 33 out of 35 as an indicator of consistency and the "top 40" behaviors in a group are judged to define the most important behaviors, then a total of 6 of the 112 behaviors meet these consistency criteria. One (1) behavior was included in all groups' top 40 lists of behaviors, 4 behaviors were in 34 of the 35 groups' top 40 and 1 behavior was in 33 of the groups' top 40 behaviors. If these criteria for defining agreement consistency are acceptable, then the question is "Does the identification of six behaviors offer support for the position that a common core of critical teaching behaviors exists as the sole focus in an internship assessment program?" We think not! Every group would have 34 behaviors judged equally important as the 6 selected (all are in the top 40), but these 34 would be unassessed.

Different examples may be taken from Table 2 addressing the same questions. Naturally, if one lessens the "number of groups" needed to define sufficient agreement consistency or if the list of defined important behaviors is expanded, the number of behaviors meeting the criteria increases. The obvious dilemma is deciding what the acceptable criteria levels are. The data collected requesting that respondents identify a cut-point on the nine point scale that

separated the groups of behaviors into those definitely needing to be part of an assessment and those that, while important, could forego assessment offers some guidance in setting the criteria for defining the set of "critically important" behaviors. The mean scale value for the cut-point was calculated for all 35 groups. These values were extremely consistent, ranging from a low of 5.54 to a high of 7.42 with 80% of the groups having means in the 6.0 to 6.9 range. The overall mean cut-point was a scale value of 6.43. Given that behaviors were forced to be equally distributed across the nine-point scale continuum (seven per category), the proportional number of the 112 behaviors estimated to be above the mean cut-point and therefore critical to the assessment is approximately 80 behaviors. The mean cut-point information offers some basis for establishing the top 80 behaviors on any group's list as the defined most important behaviors and critical for inclusions in the assessment.

An empirical basis for establishing the agreement criteria for the number of groups is nonexistent. How much group disagreement should be tolerated as an indicator that a behavior is not perceived consistently enough as important (in the top 80!). Given the "top 80" criterion, greater group consistency might be required. From Table 2, 100% agreement identifies a core of 22 behaviors while 60% agreement (21 of 35) identifies 82 behaviors. For us, 60% agreement is not sufficient. Allowing a behavior into a common core assessment set when 14 groups may not have ranked it in their top 80 list of important behaviors does not present a very convincing case as to its judged importance relative to the other available behaviors to be assessed.

The data in Table 2 indicate that different common cores of important behaviors can be found based on alternative criteria used. It should be noted that as the criteria are weakened for inclusion of a behavior, the pool expands rather than changing completely. Behaviors meeting the most stringent criteria are those for which the greatest agreement exists and they will always continue to be part of an identified core. The question addressed in this paper, however, is not whether a "best" common core can be identified, but rather, does the overall evidence warrant the need to differentiate among certification and other educator groups when one addresses the perceived important teaching behaviors on which to focus if the first year teacher is to develop into an effective teacher. The evidence as we interpret these data is that there are several behaviors under any reasonable criteria that are viewed as very important i.e., in the top 10, by some of the groups in one group, but would not meet the criteria for inclusion in a core set.

To provide summary evidence of this occurrence, a common core was arbitrarily selected using the criteria that 34 of the 35 groups must have a behavior included in their top 80 behaviors. Referencing Table 2, 41 behaviors met this criteria. For informational purposes these behaviors are identified by an asterisk in the listing of the 112 behaviors in Appendix A. Beyond the 41 behaviors, "miss" charts were tabulated identifying the number of top 10 behaviors for each group that was not included as part of the list of 41 behaviors. The greatest number of behaviors in a group's top 10, but not on the common core of 41 behaviors selected, was 5 for the teacher certified in early childhood education. Five groups had four behaviors in their top 10, but not on the list of 41, 5 groups

had "3 misses", 12 groups had "2 misses," 7 groups had "1 miss" and 7 groups had "0 misses" where all 10 of their top behaviors were on the list of 41. By focusing on a common core, 28 of the 35 groups would have at least one very important behavior to that group ignored.

Conclusion

The external criterion of efficiency, with respect to time and labor for the user, is an acceptable standard against which to evaluate an assessment system when this standard is applied at the conclusion of a psychometric adventure, and not as the directive that forces the assessment development process. From our analysis we would affirm the skepticism of Scriven (1987) and Shulman (1987) that a single, encompassing array of performance behaviors exist that are appropriate and central to all beginning teaching contexts. While a limited degree of consistency and endorsement can be found for behaviors over fields and stakeholder groups, the numbers are not consistent, unanimous, unbiased or sufficient. The viability of a single common core of behaviors is a delusion that when fostered will seriously comprise the validity of a performance evaluation system.

References

Burry, J. A., Poggio, J. P. and Glasnapp, D. R. (1987). A catalogue of effective teaching behaviors and characteristics. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C.

Edwards, A. (1963). Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. Appleton, Century, Crofts: New York.

Goertz, M. (1986). State Educational Standards: A 50 State Survey. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Poggio, J. P., Glasnapp, D., Miller, M. D., Tollefson, N. and Burry, J. A. (1986). Strategies for validating teacher certification tests. Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice, 18-25.

Sandefur, J. T. (1986). State assessment trends. AACTE Briefs, 12-14.

Scriven, M. (1987). Validity in personnel evaluation. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1(1), 9-24.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1-22.

Table 1: Frequency distribution of behaviors categorized by variability (inconsistency) of group mean ratings of importance

Standard Deviation Interval	Behavior Code (Overall Mean Rating of Importance)						
less than .5	C41 (3.89)	E14 (5.89)	F4 (3.86)				
.50 to .59	A3 (5.39) C37 (4.22)	A11 (7.44) E10 (7.71)	B1 (5.46) E16 (6.97)	B6 (5.39) F16 (6.63)	C7 (3.53)	C17 (4.77)	C30 (3.94)
.60 to .69	A4 (5.47) C18 (4.20) E12 (5.88)	A6 (5.45) C23 (4.18) F1 (3.11)	A8 (6.20) C26 (3.11) F3 (3.14)	A9 (6.61) C40 (5.04) F5 (3.82)	A10 (6.06) D12 (3.91) F12 (3.35)	A12 (7.08) E1 (4.35) F14 (6.20)	B7 (6.13) E7 (5.66)
.70 to .79	A5 (4.29) E8 (5.13)	B4 (4.27) E13 (5.61)	B5 (4.57) F6 (5.41)	C15 (4.66)	C31 (6.21)	C33 (6.72)	E6 (5.71)
.80 to .89	B2 (5.10) C19 (4.60) D5 (5.61)	B10 (5.19) C28 (6.30) D7 (4.41)	B12 (5.33) C29 (5.65) D10 (4.23)	C2 (5.21) C35 (4.56) E3 (6.34)	C4 (3.11) D1 (5.60) F7 (4.93)	C9 (4.50) D2 (4.31) F13 (5.08)	C16 (4.26) D4 (3.78)
.90 to .99	B3 (5.40) C24 (6.36) F2(3.26)	C5 (3.70) C25 (6.31) F8 (3.86)	C10 (5.45) C27 (4.56) F11 (3.91)	C14 (3.66) C36 (4.65)	C20 (4.56) C39 (4.20)	C21 (4.09) D8 (4.07)	C22 (6.34) D9 (4.62)
1.00 to 1.09	A7 (7.05) C32 (4.86)	B9 (5.52) C38 (4.23)	B13 (4.37) D3 (4.70)	B14 (6.82) F10 (6.03)	C3 (3.79) F15 (3.52)	C11 (4.75)	C12 (3.80)
1.10 to 1.19	A1 (3.19)	A2 (5.72)	E2 (4.56)	E15(5.52)	F9 (4.42)		
1.20 to 1.29	C1 (5.37)	C6 (5.08)	C13 (3.36)	D11 (4.10)	E11 (6.81)		
1.30 to 1.39	A13 (6.04)	B8 (6.45)	B11 (4.94)	E5 (5.25)	E9 (6.50)		
greater than 1.40	C34 (5.68)	D6 (5.28)	E4 (4.22)				

Table 2: Number of Behaviors Meeting Various Agreement Criteria By Being Ranked in the Groups' Top Behaviors Using Different Cutoff Values

Criteria for set of top Behaviors incremented by Units of 10	Minimum Agreement Criteria for Number of the 35 groups needed to have ranked a behavior in its top set for inclusion as a common core behavior.														
	35	34	33	32	31	30	29	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21
Top 10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	3
Top 20	--	--	--	--	1*	3**	3	4	4	4	6	9	9	9	10
Top 30	--	--	1	5	7	7	9	9	10	10	11	13	14	17	19
Top 40	1	5	6	7	9	10	12	13	16	20	23	24	26	28	32
Top 50	3	7	11	15	18	20	23	24	28	31	36	37	37	42	47
Top 60	5	12	16	21	29	36	38	40	42	44	46	51	52	52	53
Top 70	14	24	31	38	40	43	46	47	49	50	56	60	63	64	64
Top 80	22	41	44	48	49	53	57	62	64	68	71	72	77	80	82

* Number of behaviors ranked by at least this many of the 35 groups in the groups' top sets (10, 20, ...80) of important behaviors.

** As an example, only one behavior was ranked by 31 of the 35 groups in their top 20 and 2 behaviors were ranked by 30 of the 35 groups in their top 20; therefore only 3 behaviors had rankings by 30 or more of the 35 groups in their top 20 behaviors.

APPENDIX A

KANSAS INTERNSHIP ASSESSMENT INVENTORY
Master List of Behaviors

A. PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND ACTIVITIES

* A1. Is dependable.

A2. Complies with written laws and policies regarding confidentiality in handling personal information about all personnel.

A3. Promotes school as a concerned, responsive, emotionally supportive environment.

A4. Maintains a consistently pleasant behavior.

* A5. Functions in a controlled and effective manner under pressure.

A6. Is willing to ask for help and advice.

A7. Conducts effective parent-teacher conferences.

A8. Maintains good interpersonal relations with other staff members.

A9. Apprises administrators or appropriate personnel of school-related matters.

A10. Seeks to implement the recommendations of evaluations of his/her personal performance.

A11. Participates in school-sponsored inservice training activities.

A12. Implements recommendations to demonstrate growth in teaching skills.

A13 Establishes ongoing two-way communication with parents to support student progress based on mutual respect.

B. LESSON PREPARATION

B1. Understands the appropriate scope and sequence for teaching the content.

B2. Develops short and long term instructional plans and materials (for example lessons, units, modules, etc.) which include objectives activities, materials and evaluation techniques.

B3. Considers student attention span in lesson design.

* B4. Has material organized and readily available for students.

* B5. Selects and uses content methods, materials and articles consistent with objectives of the lesson.

B6. Has knowledge of alternative instructional material.

B7. Reflects an understanding of learning theory in planning and instruction.

B8. Utilizes knowledge of child growth and development in classroom practices.

B9. Modifies instructional activities making provisions for students who work at different rates.

B10. Prepares instructional units which reflect the goals, objectives and content of the curriculum guide.

B11. Takes individual differences into account in planning and instruction.

B12. Promotes maximum student involvement by providing a variety of instructional activities.

* B13. Selects goals and objectives appropriate to pupil need.

B14. Obtains and uses information from colleagues to assist students with special needs.

C. LESSON PRESENTATION

C1. Communicates orally without errors in grammar.

C2. Breaks complex rules and procedures into steps.

* C3. Provides instruction that maximizes student time on appropriate tasks.

* C4. Communicates enthusiasm for learning and teaching.

C5. Conducts class with poise and self-assurance.

C6. Takes action to maintain attention and participation by all students in group activities.

* C7. Makes classwork interesting and relevant for students.

* C8. Creates and maintains a motivational set for learning.

C9. Communicates the instructional objectives and purpose of the learning activities to students.

C10. Answers procedural questions asked by students following direction-giving.

C11. Oral communication is fluent and effective.

* C12. Gives clear directions for use of materials.

* C13. Prepares and presents lessons in a clear, logical and sequential manner.

* C14. Possess accurate and up-to-date knowledge of the subject matter.

C15. Incorporates into daily instruction content from previous instruction to insure continuity and sequence.

* C16. Insures that materials and information can be read, seen or heard by the students.

* C17. Maintains a classroom characterized by purposeful student behavior appropriate for the objectives of the lesson.

* C18. Communicates and fosters a respect for learning.

C19. Is careful to focus student attention on important points in class lessons.

C20. Encourages questions and discussion from all students by using effective questioning patterns and techniques.

* C21. Reteaches concepts/skills students are not learning.

C22. Summarizes or achieves closure.

* C23. Provides an opportunity for all students to apply or practice knowledge and skills being learned.

C24. Groups students for instructional activity in a manner which assists the learning process.

C25. Accomplishes smooth and orderly transitions between lessons and parts of lessons.

* C26. Communicates at a level of understanding for the students.

C27. Answers content questions asked by students.

C28. Conducts lesson or activity at an appropriate pace, slowing presentations when necessary for student understanding.

C29. Moderates voice, movement and pace to hold students' attention during lessons.

* C30. Demonstrates a concern for the achievement level of students in the class.

C31. Provides assignments that can be completed independently.

C32. Encourages and facilitates independent thinking by students.

C33. Uses available audio-visual teaching aids as appropriate (overhead projector, exhibits, cassette recorder, flip charts, video, models, computers, etc.).

C34. Provides appropriate instruction to students with special needs.

* C35. Utilizes various teaching strategies to accommodate learning styles.

C36. Provides illustrations, examples and applications of the material during the lesson.

* C37. Is able to adjust and use alternative instructional methodologies.

* C38. Provides opportunities that foster creative and critical thinking skills, problem-solving and decision making.

C39. Encourages questions and discussions from all students.

C40. When a student does not correctly answer questions, uses strategies such as rephrasing, giving clues, probing or asking new questions to obtain a correct response.

* C41. Demonstrates flexibility in lesson plans and teaching techniques as the learning situation requires.

IV. CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT

D1. Organizes and maintains the physical environment of the classroom in a functional pleasant and orderly manner conducive to student learning.

* D2. Displays consistency in dealing with negative behavior.

* D3. Redirects students when they are not on task.

D4. Establishes, teaches and reinforces classroom rules and procedures.

D5. Insures that rule violations carry appropriate consequences.

D6. Exercises care for students' physical safety.

* D7. Monitors student behavior.

* D8. Handles classroom incidents and emergencies effectively.

* D9. Students are appropriately reinforced and corrected to achieve desired behavior.

* D10. Helps students develop self-management skills (e.g. work habits, behavior, study skills).

* D11. Manages undesirable student behavior in the least disruptive manner.

* D12. Is able to analyze classroom problems and is resourceful in seeking solutions.

V. EVALUATION

* E1. Gives immediate and specific oral and/or written feedback.

E2. Maintains clear, firm and reasonable work standards and due dates.

E3. Develops and maintains systems for keeping group and individual records.

E4. Uses a grading system that is consistent and fair.

E5. Promptly provides feedback on tests and assigned out-of-class work.

E6. Demonstrates appropriate expectation levels for students through assignments and assignment grading.

E7. Monitors pupil progress in order to provide assistance as necessary to complete assignments.

E8. Continuously evaluates the results of instruction during the lesson through observations of verbal and nonverbal cues from students.

E9. Identifies and refers students who require the assistance of specialists.

E10. Analyzes and then communicates performance teacher-made and standardized tests to students and parents.

E11. Makes use of all available sources (student records, parent conferences, counselors, resource specialists, test results, and other diagnostic tools) to assess the learning needs and capabilities of individual pupils.

E12. Uses a variety of techniques for evaluation and feedback.

E13. Regularly monitors the extent to which the methodology is achieving lesson objectives.

E14. Makes changes in instruction based on feedback from sources such as students, peers, administrators or analysis of classroom performance on test results.

E15. Recognizes when students are deficient in prerequisite skills and provides or recommends corrective action.

E16. Assesses the congruence of instructional objectives and student achievement.

VI. RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENTS

* F1. Treats students in a tactful, warm, caring and empathic manner.

* F2. Exerts firm yet friendly control of class.

* F3. Respects the contributions, dignity and worth of each student.

* F4 Establishes clear lines of communication and interaction with students.

* F5. Establishes rapport with students.

F6. Is receptive and responsive to pupil initiated dialogue when appropriate.

F7. Inspires students by example.

* F8. Shows patience with or empathy for learners who need additional time for explanations.

F9. Develops in students a consideration of the rights, feelings and ideas of others.

F10. Seeks, accepts and uses students' ideas.

* F11. Instills students with a sense of satisfaction and accomplishment in their achievement.

* F12. Motivates students to achieve to their ability level.

F13. Promotes positive student interaction.

F14. Utilizes learning activities to develop attitudes, appreciations and values of students.

* F15. Helps pupils develop positive self-concepts.

F16. Plans and conducts one-to-one conferences as needed.

APPENDIX B

Sample of Behaviors and Description

A3. Promotes school as a concerned, responsive, emotionally supportive environment fostering self-discipline.

The teacher creates a learning environment that encourages students to be self-reliant and to think and act responsibly. Students receive positive feedback when they attempt and are able to work independently, correct themselves, or determine solutions to problems without assistance. The teacher provides support and encouragement when students behave in an independent and responsible manner. The teacher communicates empathy and support when students are dealing with problems (behavioral or academic) and involves students in the solution of the problem. This behavior is not at the standard level when students are heavily dependent upon their teaching or when the teacher does not take an active role in promoting independent, self-disciplined behavior.

A4. Maintains a consistently pleasant behavior.

The teacher displays a pleasant disposition to all students in and out of class. Behavior indicating moodiness in response to situation circumstances is not evident. Any behavior shift to an unpleasant disposition occurs only if the situation requires it (e.g., extreme student misbehavior). Evidence that this behavior is not at the standard level is when the teacher is aloof, abrupt, moody or displays other unpleasant behaviors such as anger when the situation does not demand such behavior. The teacher is selective in the students to whom they display a pleasant disposition.